

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it concerns,

I am writing this submission to express my strong opposition to the proposal to deregulate new and emerging GM techniques and their food products. Such changes pose new and un-assessed risks that would undermine FSANZ's primary and crucial responsibilities to safeguard the safety of our food and would prevent our fundamental right to be informed of what is in our food.

I am deeply concerned that FSANZ has relied on advice from scientists, who have serious conflicts of interest, to conclude that these new GM foods pose no greater risks than existing foods. Those seeking to commercialise GM plants, animals and microbes should play NO role in deciding how - or even whether - foods derived from them should be regulated.

I strongly oppose changes to the Food Code that would permit a wide range of GM foods - including meat and milk from genetically modified animals and substances like stevia and vanilla produced by genetically modified microbes in factory vats - to be manufactured using experimental methods. These methods lack proven safety data and would be sold without proper safety assessment or labelling. These changes would undermine FSANZ's key responsibilities to ensure food safety and our right to know what is in our food.

Agrochemical companies cannot be trusted to self-assess the safety of GM foods without scrutiny from an unbiased, independent party. All GM foods should be independently assessed for their health and environmental hazards and risks as agrochemical companies have an appalling record of manipulating data to promote dangerous products.

All GM foods should be labelled as GM, and be traceable thereby allowing consumers, farmers, food producers/manufacturers and retailers to avoid them for a variety of important reasons including:

1. gene editing techniques have been found to make genetic changes that could never occur in nature and to result in widespread genetic damage that often goes undetected by GM developers.
2. our right to know how our food is grown and raised so that we, as consumers, can make informed choices for our health.

It is disturbing, and it deeply concerns me, that FSANZ has relied on advice from lobbying scientists with serious conflicts of interest to conclude that these new GM foods pose no greater risks than existing foods. Those seeking to commercialise GM plants, animals and microbes should play no role in deciding how - or even whether - foods derived from them should be regulated.

These proposed changes would make Australia one of very few countries in the world to allow genetically modified animal products into our food chain with no regulation or labelling. This would put us at odds with our international trading partners, which FSANZ admits "may have a significant impact on trade". The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, an international agreement signed by 166 governments worldwide, and the UN's food standards body Codex Alimentarius agree that all GM techniques differ from conventional breeding and that pre-market safety assessments are essential before GM organisms are used in food. In

my view de-regulation will damage the Australian agricultural export industry because overseas buyers will prefer to buy from countries that provide independent surveillance and safety data of its food products.

To implement the proposed changes is a retrograde step into the unknown and has the potential to severely impact the health of our food chain – animals, plants, soil - and population far into the future.

I support expanding the definition for 'gene technology' so FSANZ continues to assess and regulate all techniques and methods of genetic modification, other than conventional breeding.

In conclusion, I re-iterate, I vigorously oppose changes to the FSANZ Food Code that would allow a wide range of GM foods to be sold without safety assessment or labelling.

Thank you for taking my valid, logical and informed concerns into consideration.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted text]  
[Redacted text]

[Redacted text]  
[Redacted text]  
[Redacted text]  
[Redacted text]

[Redacted text]

[Redacted text]  
[Redacted text]